UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,649	04/16/2004	Robert Paterson	71493-1243/pw	8475
7380 SMART & BIC	7590 11/19/200 GGAR	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 2999		MAHMOUDZADEH, NIMA		
900-55 METC OTTAWA, ON	: -	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CANADA			2477	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/19/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

forpara@smart-biggar.ca

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/825,649	PATERSON ET AL.	
	_		
	Examiner	Art Unit	

	NIMA MAHMOUDZADEH	2477				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
ixtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
NOTICE OF APPEAL						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company of the compa	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed amendment of the pr	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying t				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 12,13 and 27 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment						
canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 12,13 and 27. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-11,14-26 and 28-31. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but		•				
	2230 TO Figure the application in	ISHALISH TOT AHOWATT	2004400.			
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/N.M./ Examiner, Art Unit 2477	/Gregory B Sefcheck/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2477				

Continuation of 13. Other: On page 13 of the applicant's response, the applicant argued that the prior art of the record fail to teach "measuring performance parameters between a first location and a second location in a communications network" of claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Paragraph [0021] of Purpura discloses the traffic control between two routers which can be traffic congestion control that has to be performed based on the measurements and performance data. On page 14 of the applicant's response, the applicant argued that the prior art of the record fail to teach "service-affecting event computation means for analyzing performance parameters measured by the performance measurement means" as recited in claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. On page 7 of Kogan et al., the outage data that can be a service-affecting event is being collected which is a function of obtaining performance (being up or down) measurement . On page 14 of the applicant response, the applicant argued that the prior art of the record fail to teach "determining components within the communications network which are related to dependability metrics to be reported upon." of claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Fig. 1 and page 5, of Kogan et al., an agent perform the function of outage measurement within individual elements and function of reporting the failure events periodically to NMS which are dependent on interaction between the measuring elements and NMS. On page 15 of the applicant response, the applicant argued that the prior art of the record fail to teach "a user interface for supplying the dependability measurement system with system parameters and control information" as recited in claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. On page 5 of Kogan et al., there are two interfaces, one being flat for outage data and the other a control interface for configuration and managamenet commands that can be a user interface. Also, on page 7 of Kogan et al., is is shown that the operator sets the threshold value at the time of outage measurement configuration. On page 17 of the applicant's response, the applicant argued that there is no suggestion of a desirability of the claimed invention in

any of the references that would serve as a reason for one skilled in the art to combine the collection of references identified by the Examiner. The examiner respectfully disagrees. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the communication between NMS and measurement agent(element) of Kogan et al. to include the traffic control function between two devices taught by Purpura in order to speed up the configuration/ traffic control and reduce the delay. The remainder of the claims and above means/function rejections remain rejected due to the above reasonings.